

MANSFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Board of Education Questions Regarding Schools' Building Project
as of March 11, 2010

Martha Kelly 3-5-10

1. Rick Lawrence stated at our 2/11/10 meeting—that for Option C (rehab two PreK-4 schools plus MMS, close one PreK-4), there are “no plans; cost is on a theoretical basis.” For Option C—with no preliminary drawings—it is difficult to understand the scope of the project; therefore, I find it hard to make a concrete judgment call without knowing how the project cost was estimated.

Because option B (rehab 3 PreK-4 schools plus MMS) and C (rehab 2 preK-4 schools plus MMS) share similar renovations, I assume Option C would include media center and computer room additions, etc., as noted in Option B but this is not delineated on the Families of Options handouts.

If it is not definitely known which school is to be closed under Option C – or what would be added to the two remaining PreK-4 buildings, how can this cost estimate be accurate? The interior space analysis figures indicate Goodwin would be closed, increasing the square footage of Southeast 55% and Vinton 61%. This appears not to be a serious option.

As was discussed at a meeting of the School Building Committee prior to the first presentation to the PTAs, the slides that depicted larger additions to two schools to arrive at the costs for Option C were deleted. This was done so the choice of which school that would be closed did not become a contentious issue. In fact, schematic drawings were prepared to show the additions at Southeast and Vinton so that Newfield Construction could arrive at the numbers indicated in the Families of Options. Both schools that would be selected for this Option C would have additions of the size required to house all of Mansfield's student population at the two schools, thus allowing one school to be abandoned for school use. One significant reason for choosing these two schools was because they present more site area capable of supporting the larger additions than is available at Goodwin.

It was also mentioned during the PTA meetings that, in the interest of time, I would not be repeating the Mansfield Middle School scope of additions, relocatable classroom replacement, the addition to relocate the main school office and nurse along with all of the other upgrades – such as roof replacement with solar panels, accessibility alterations, window replacements and other major interior improvements. These same improvements are a “constant” in Options B, C and D.

2. For Option B-according to the schematics-we are adding classrooms to buildings that the state (as I understand it) already deems are more than large enough for our student population. Goodwin's square footage would increase 42%, Southeast's 33% and Vinton's, 34%. Perhaps we should be more efficient and conservative, scaling back our wish list, not bumping out walls for more storage (assuming that's why rooms are being extended). Project(s) seem to be more wish-driven than budget-driven.

I am not convinced that moving school offices to the front of the building is mandatory. We now have a new, good security system at each building. Our high school and the new school we visited in Glastonbury have front and center offices. However, despite that, both have a human being sitting at a desk at the front entrance to monitor foot traffic.

The increased square footage is to accommodate the new library/media centers, expanded classrooms for the PK & K rooms, relocating the offices (Goodwin and Southeast), cafeterias and other deficiencies. The additions were not driven for storage purposes, although that is a major problem in all of the classrooms because they lack such facilities having been designed for 1955+/- teaching activities.

3. Is the %5.225 million difference in MMS work between Option A (\$7.384m) and Options B, C, & D (\$12.6m for both B and C, 11.9m for D) primarily for relocating the front office and adding classrooms where the portables are (110,400 sq.ft. now, increases to 116,200 sq.ft.=5700 sq.ft.;5%--\$917 sq. foot)? What else is included?

The difference is because in Options B, C & D the existing relocatable classrooms will be replaced with new, permanent construction and there will be a new addition for the main school office and nurse. The 110,433 will be reduced by the demolition of the relocatables and then approximately 9,000 s.f. will be added for the new classrooms and offices thus arriving at the 116,197 s.f.

4. For projects, A, B, and C-in all four buildings, please list schedule and costs of yearly and forecasted capital improvements that would appear in the budget for the next ten years (maintenance of roofs, windows, heating systems, alarm systems, elevators, etc.) and separate them from proposed enhancement costs (i.e. extract Option A from Options B and C as it appears Option A costs are included in Options B and C). What maintenance/capital expenses are already planned and in our budget for our present buildings?

The plans for the school renovations/consolidation began January 2006. If approved, the new building won't be occupied for another two years. In the 2006-2012 six-year span, what capital improvements (and costs) have been/are planned to maintain our existing four schools?

For Option D, please list the maintenance schedule and cost of capital improvements that would begin five to ten years after proposed building has been built.

All the capital cost for projects B and C would be taken care off in the renovations of the schools. There should be no capital improvements necessary. For project A the capital improvements necessary would include:

- a.) new heating systems
- b.) new air ventilation systems
- c.) new roofs and solar panels
- d.) re-insulate the walls and install new windows
- e.) new fire alarm and security systems
- f.) new computer controlled room maintenance systems
- g.) new playgrounds
- h.) new gym floors and dividing doors in gyms
- i.) upgrade kitchens with new freezers and refrigerators
- j.) new septic systems
- k.) upgraded electrical systems
- l.) eliminate confined spaces under each school so we can do maintenance
- m.) new plumbing fixtures and piping, piping is 50 years old.
- n.) replacement and repair of cabling/infrastructure and phone system

The priorities for these improvements would come from input from the school staff and the maintenance staff. Total cost for these improvements is ESTIMATED to be 22,000,000.

Right now there is very little funding in the budget for capital improvements. Roof repair is included and 25,000 for unknown repairs such as pumps, electrical panels, smaller things that are difficult to predict.

For option D there will be no capital improvements planned. Most maintenance expenses will be for preventative maintenance projects which are hard to quantify because we do not know what the mechanical systems will be except to say they will be very energy efficient.

5. Re the MMS Fossil Fuel Project: 12/10/08 minutes of Building Committee (attached) note that "alternates" were eliminated from original bid because of cost overruns. Are these overrun expenses (How much?) included in the proposed project work for MMS?

No costs related to the MMS Heating Upgrade project are included in the School Renovation Proposals. Additional funding was approved by the Town Council and the School Facilities Unit in October/November, 2009 to fund the alternates.

6. Re: the 3/12/08 Building Committee minutes (Attachment 1 – P.9): Reads that Newfield Construction is chosen as construction manager for this school project – extending their work on the fossil fuel project. Is the school building/reconstruction project going to be sent out for bids, or is Newfield – as construction manager-granted this project already? Curious about how this works.

Their contract does not automatically extend to this project. There is a clause to negotiate an extension however, we will follow School Facility Unit guidelines for the bidding process.

7. When teachers were interviewed, asking for their input, were they asked (1) what changes would they like to have made in their present classroom/building or (2) how they would like one new, large elementary school configured?

When teachers and staff were interviewed they were asked for their thoughts and suggestions about deficiencies and improvements to the existing buildings. NO discussions were held with them about a new, consolidated school. When the School Building Committee received the cost estimates from Newfield Construction for the original "directive" (Option B), discussions were held about methods to maximize state reimbursement and reduce the anticipated cost to Mansfield. One such method is to "renovate like new" such that all finishes, materials, spaces, roofs, windows, equipment and systems are replaced with new. The state requires these costs to be less than the cost to construct a new school of a size no larger than the maximum allowed per state reimbursement standards. It was not until these discussions were held that the School Building Committee then asked about other options, including a new, consolidated school – months after our interviews with staff.

Questions: The following refer to Option A.

1. As part of the planning process, did the building committee consider re-configuration of the interior space within the existing footprint? If yes, please explain why it was dropped as an option.

No, because the directive for Option A was to maintain the existing footprint and building configuration as they presently exist. If re-configuration within the existing building were to be accomplished it would result in a completely new Option with associated costs. Another reason this was not considered was because the existing buildings lack the large space needed for a Library/Media Center of the area most suited for an elementary school. To create that space significant demolition and re-construction would be required and the resulting size of the building would provide less teaching areas than currently available. If the Board of Education changed its policy on the number of students per teacher ratio by increasing the number of students in each room this might free up some space that could be used for the Library/Media Center and computer rooms. However, we have been informed that Mansfield is proud of its current ratio and this would not be an option to consider.

2. If we do not change the footprint of the building, do we then qualify for state support for a new roof, ADA improvements, upgraded heating system, and energy-efficient windows?

Yes, re-roofing is eligible for state reimbursement if the roof is over 20 years old. ADA and other code related renovations are also eligible for reimbursement. The heating system is not, as with any "upgrade, repair, replacement or rework" item. The window replacement would be partially eligible – one "rescue and ventilation" unit per classroom space would be eligible for materials and labor while the rest would have to be negotiated depending on its energy efficiency, if the project was submitted as an energy conservation project and the balance for the materials only.

3. Did we consider any state contribution in the estimated \$22,000,000 for Option A?

Yes, the total cost for MMS and the 3 elementary schools is indicated at \$30.38M and the net cost to Mansfield \$22M, the approximate \$8M difference being the estimated state reimbursement.

4. How did we derive the \$22,000,000 estimate?

The 22,000,000 figure over 20 years was developed by Tom Di Mauro and Bill Hammon. Bill estimated what would need to be done over the next 20 years and Tom estimated the cost to complete the projects under ideal conditions. It did not include major repairs that might need to be completed while school is in session and students relocated.

The rest of my questions concern the cost of carrying vacant buildings.

1. For FY 2008-2009, energy costs for Goodwin, Southeast, and Vinton, were \$70,419; \$97,809; and \$98,491, respectively. Based on these numbers, I'm not sure why the total estimate (Bill Hammon) for utilities and maintenance is \$15,000 per building. We would still need lights, timers, and a (most significantly) the heat to be maintained at 55 or above.

We would heat the buildings to 50 degrees or less. There would be no a/c in offices, lighting would be at a minimum. Our manpower would consist of one person walking through the buildings once a week to look for problems. The major expense would be roof maintenance. I am not anticipating maintaining these buildings indefinitely. We believe some resolution to the building use would be made soon.

2. On page 5 of "Financial Information Packet" dated December 14, 2009, we reduce our custodial staff by one. Does this reduction account for the upkeep that will be required on the three vacant buildings?

We could reduce the custodial staff by one person because the new building will incorporate many labor saving devices like wax free floors so we no longer need to wax or strip floors in order to clean them, toilets suspended from the walls not floors so it is much easier to clean under them, tile on walls instead of sheet rock so the cleaning is much easier. There is also less square footage to clean in a new one school option.

3. Similarly, on page 4 of the same report, we see a 50% decrease in building repairs (\$39,000 to \$20,000) and a 50% decrease in grounds supplies (\$4,000 to \$2,000). Please explain why those figures are decreasing and not increasing, as we will have the hard costs of four buildings to repair, and four properties which will require grounds upkeep.

We have decreased the building repair budget because a new building should not require nearly as many repairs. Most of the funds will be used for preventative maintenance programs. The funds for ground supplies were used to purchase mulch for 3 schools flower gardens. I believe the cost of mulch will be much less for one school.

4. We would still need to repair heating systems & roofs on the three schools should they break down. I can't find where that cost has been added to the other options.

We believe that we can maintain the vacant schools for a couple of years for the 15,000.00 figure. If the town decides to keep the buildings indefinitely then we might have to reconsider this figure

5. What is the annual cost of insuring three vacant buildings? **\$3,000 per year total.**

Min Lin 3-9-10

1) Construction cost for all options are based on projection and no details break downs. I would like to see the composition of the numbers.

See Attachment 2 – P. 15

2) I carefully reviewed the Estimated Cost Comparisons put out by the Town finance office and came up following comments.

- a. I would really like to see the detail breakdown for Option A's \$22M. I can see that there is \$1.1M in year one for heating system, \$1.1M in year 2 for ventilation system and \$1.1M in year 3 for roof. What are rest(\$18.7M) of the \$22M budgeted for?

See Attachment 3 – P. 20

- b. Under option D, town wise Cost of Salaries and FB for Maintenance and all other related consumption, i.e. building maintenance services, would increase since now the town would have four buildings to take care of vs. THREE. **The new building would be designed so that it reduces the cost of cleaning & maintenance, thereby creating the savings. For example, materials used for flooring would require little maintenance; toilets would be wall mounted rather than floor mounted, making mopping the floors quicker, etc. Bill Hammon can provide additional information. Costs are included to "mothball" the old buildings.**
- c. Option D vs. other options, town wise energy cost would remain the same or decrease slightly, not so significantly \$401,600 = 637,500-235,900)as listed in the compassion sheet again since town would have four buildings to heat vs THREE. Also, when the capital renovations for boilers % heating systems, ventilation systems, roofs replacement and window replacement are completed, energy efficiency should increase. It seems to me that this decrease take into consideration in the projected energy cost of \$577,500 in option A.
Estimates have been adjusted to reflect approximately \$200,000 savings.
- d. At Southeast town hall meeting, one citizen questioned the per household cost between \$148 and \$50 for Option A and Option B. Cheryl mentioned that it was because saving from energy cost. Per Estimated Cost, Net Annual Cost (which including EVERYTHING) for Option A is \$18,548,760 and for Option D is \$18,056,300. The net annual increase between A and D is net increase of \$492,460 or 2.66%[(18,548,760-18,056,300)/18,548,760]. How CAN the Mill Rate increase per household be 60% [(148-59)/148]? Not talking about all other opportunity cost with the three empty buildings (heating, maintenance and insurance or conversion costs)!

Additional information regarding the breakdown of the mill rate estimates was provided.

In my view, the whole cost projections for all options are not subjective and comprehensive and in favorable to Option D cost wise. We owe our taxpayers an objective and inclusive cost projection.

3) I understand that R Lawrence is on the building committee. Do they have the voting right or not? If they do, I think it is a conflict of interest.

Rick Lawrence is not a member of the building committee and thus does not have a voting right.

Mark LaPlaca 3-9-10

1. Can Cherie give a line by line explanation of the Estimated Cost Comparisons on pg 1?

2. What is the estimated mill rate increase and average cost per household for each option looking only at debt service and associated costs. Second - What decrease to the mill rate and average cost per household is generated due to estimated savings (salaries, energy, maintenance etc)? The first minus the second would equal the numbers on the chart - I am interested in looking at them separately for each option.

See additional chart provided.

3. On page 2 of the Estimated Cost Comparisons - it appears the # of buildings does not include the Middle School - is that an error?

The Middle School should be included in each of the Families of Options we prepared.

4. Can Cherie explain the note about the approved but unissued bonds of \$870,000 est. on the bottom of page 3 of the Estimated Cost Comparison?

The Town has the authorization to issue bonds for various projects, outside of the school building project, that will impact debt service when they are issued.

5. Could someone outline the extent of disruption to classrooms for Options B and C in terms of construction - moving kids, etc.?

Since your current buildings do not have sufficient "swing space" for the relocation of classrooms during the course of construction and the leasing of portables adds considerable cost (non-reimbursable) as well as significant site constraints, the plan was to construct and use some of the new space for "swing space". The completion for occupancy of these new areas would take approximately one year and then the Library/Media Centers, Computer Rooms, etc. would have to house regular classrooms as the wings with Classrooms are renovated for approximately another year. As mentioned at the PTA and other meetings, construction and renovations of this degree will inevitably create dust, interruptions, noise and inconveniences over the entire length of time construction activities occur.

6. Is the list of repairs and maintenance in the Family of Options under Option A comprehensive? What is not included there - do we know?

See Attachment 4 – P. 24

Chris Kueffner 3-9-10

Geographically, and not considering property ownership or boundaries, where would the ideal site be for a brand new, town-wide school?

As explained at the January joint Bd of Ed/Town Council meeting (I believe Chris was not present), staff focused our initial review on Town property but we also looked at potential sites in the vicinity of the center of Town near the intersection of Spring Hill Rd and Storrs Rd and we moved concentrically outward in an attempt to find a centralized location. Of equal or greater importance, we needed to find approximately 15 acres of land with little or no physical constraints (particularly wetlands/steep slopes) with either public water/sewer accessibility or soils that would support a septic system. Based on these search considerations, we did not identify any potential private or Town-owned sites closer to the center than the SE site except for the Warren property on Maple Road that has been optioned by Masonic Care for an age restricted/assisted housing project. UConn does own some centrally located farmland off of East Rd and along Storrs Rd south of Spring Hill Rd that might be appropriate but contact with UConn's Facilities Dept resulted in a judgment that UConn would not likely be willing to consider the conveyance of the potential sites on East Rd or Storrs Rd. Since the SE site was considered physically viable, accessible by arterial (state owned) roads and somewhat central, the staff did not pursue consideration of UConn land.



**TOWN OF MANSFIELD/MANSFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE**

Wednesday, December 10, 2008

Mansfield Town Hall

Conference Room B

DRAFT

MINUTES

Present: Mary Feathers, Chair, Anne Willenborg, Mark Boyer, Elizabeth Paterson

Absent: Cherie Trahan, Anne Rash, Debra Adamczyk, Jim Palmer, Norma Fisher-Doiron, Eric Ohlund

Staff: Matt Hart, Fred Baruzzi, William Hammon, Jeff Cryan, Jeff Smith, Candace Morrell, Jaime Russell

Guest: Tom DiMauro, Newfield Construction, Mike Callahan, Fuss & O'Neil, Rick Lawrence, Rick Lawrence & Associates, Greg Padick, Director of Planning

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Ms. Paterson called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

2. Meeting Minutes

The minutes of November 12, 2008 were moved, seconded and approved unanimously.

3. Opportunity for the public to address the Committee

No one came forward.

4. Fuss & O'Neil re: MMS Fossil Fuel Project

Mr. Callahan reported that a meeting was held to eliminate the following alternates from the original bid. These include the media center, music wing, and the first floor classroom area due to the review of the previous bid being received over the authorized budget.

5. Mr. Padick, Director of Planning

Mr. Hart requested that the Committee deviate from the agenda to add Mr. Padick, Director of Planning.

Mr. Padick reported on potential sites for the one school option. Mr. Padick stated that Town-owned land should be considered first. He has been looking at sites that are in the 10, 15, or 20 acres range. However, most of the open space land purchased with Federal and State money has stipulations that require that portion to be kept in open space.

Mr. Lawrence reported that the State reimbursement guidelines reimburse 10 acres plus one acre for every 100 students and due to estimated enrollment approximately 17 acres would be needed.

Mr. Padick has looked into the site northeast of the Mansfield Middle School – which includes the school, garage and some open space that has no stipulation on what is required of the purchase. He also stated that privately owned property might be found, but the septic requirements are a big factor.

One site mentioned is the 30 to 40 acres of apple orchard located on Route 195 which is owned by UConn. It was discussed that UConn might not be willing to part with it. Mr. Padick also mentioned that approximately 1/3 of the Town is in wetlands and areas that have the most potential may not be central in Town as requirements state they must be 50 to 150 feet away from wetlands.

Mr. Smith asked about the old Mansfield Training School now owned by UConn (located off Route 44) as a potential site. Mr. Padick stated that he has not looked into that corner of Town.

Other potential sites are the 17 acres that are located behind the Mansfield Community Center but are not suitable to build due to ledge and south of the Public Works Garage which was purchased with Grant money and are held due to DEP restrictions.

Ms. Paterson noted that there was a meeting at Region 19 on the regionalization of a K-12 school system and requested that that be taken into account. The possibility of a regional property would be the Baxter property located on Baxter Road which is being leased out. However, the Agriculture Committee would want to keep this property in an agricultural state.

The Committee authorized Mr. Padick to do the following:

- 1) look at or find an approximate 17 acre piece of land not located in a neighborhood and on a main road
- 2) check with UConn regarding the apple orchard located on Route 195
- 3) in regards to the Mansfield Middle School property if not a possibility, why?
- 4) look into the property located at the Mansfield Training School

6. Architect/Construction Manager's Report

Mr. Lawrence reported that the most attractive option for the Town of Mansfield is building a new school. This would also include the best reimbursement rate. Mr. Lawrence has summarized the findings in a letter to Mr. Hart and Mr. Baruzzi.

7. Construction Manager Services

Mr. DiMauro had nothing to report.

8. Other

Next steps are as follows:

- 1) identify a probable site
- 2) evaluate the site
- 3) Lawrence Associates to do a schematic for the specific site
- 4) report to the Town Council and Board of Education
- 5) recommendations specific to site

No meeting has been scheduled at this time.

9. Adjournment

Ms. Paterson adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Patenaude
Capital Projects and Personnel Assistant



**TOWN OF MANSFIELD/MANSFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE**

Wednesday, March 12, 2008

Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building

Conference Room B

MINUTES

Present: Mary Feathers, Chair, Gordon Schimmel, Mark Boyer, Anne Willenborg

Absent: Elizabeth Paterson, Cherie Trahan, Anne Rash,

Staff: Jeff Cryan, William Hammon, Jeff Smith, Jaime Russell, Fred Baruzzi, Matt Hart, Eric Ohlund

Guest: Rick Lawrence, Rick Lawrence Associates, Tom DiMauro, Newfield Construction, Mike Callahan and Dave Jackson, Fuss & O'Neill

4. Call to Order/Roll Call

Ms. Paterson called the meeting to order at 5:39 p.m.

5. Meeting Minutes

The minutes of February 13, 2008 were moved, seconded and approved unanimously.

6. Opportunity for the public to address the Committee

No one came forward.

7. Fuss & O'Neil re: MMS Fossil Fuel Project

Mr. Callahan reported on the status of the project. The technical issue is to insure the general consensus of the new boiler room. The most appropriate location is at the back of the building a new free standing boiler room be added. The proposed gas main is coming off of Spring Hill Road through the athletic fields.

There is discussion about the overall project budget relative to the State funding. The base contract which includes the fuel conversion is about \$3.5 million and an additional work related to the project which includes additional cooling in the cafeteria, the installation of a relatively small co-gen facility and the cost of bringing the gas main in which would bring the project up to about \$4.5 million.

The detailed aspects would include two or three boilers in the boiler room, the co-gen facility would be located in the boiler room, provide new interior piping, new radiators and new rooftop dedicated outside air units which would provide additional pressure.

Mr. Hart then introduced Mr. Tom DiMauro from Newfield Construction who's firm was selected to be the Construction Manager.

8. Architect's Report

Mr. Lawrence reported on the feedback from the schools with regard to the schematic designs. He stated that the principals had some concerns and questions regarding the workability of the changes. He has forwarded these on to his consultants.

Mr. Lawrence then pointed out that requests would have to be prioritized as it was also known that not all the requests could be met. Mr. Schimmel reported that the Library Media Centers would most likely be one of the higher priorities.

Mr. Hart questioned the number of classrooms for the elementary schools. The goal is to retain three classrooms per grade level. The other rooms were proposed to be converted to special ed, etc.

9. Construction Manager Services

Mr. Lawrence went over the process of hiring the Construction Manager. Mr. Schimmel mentioned that the references came back outstanding for his work. Mr. Smith also mentioned that Newfield Construction worked on the Library Media Center at the Mansfield Middle School.

A motion was made and seconded to hire Newfield Construction as the Construction Manager for this project. The motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. DiMauro stated that his part in the process now is to discuss with Mr. Lawrence the values and schedules for the project. He will go to the schools to review the project and will meet with Mr. Lawrence to discuss the changes in the buildings.

After the referendum is passed Mr. Lawrence and Newfield will continue to discuss schedules and value engineering.

When the construction starts Newfield will be on site daily. They will make sure safety plans are in place for both the bidders and occupants of the buildings.

10. Other

The next School Building Committee meeting will be on April 23, 2008 at 5:00 p.m. The MMS Fuel Conversion Project will be on April 23, 2008 at 4:00 p.m.

11. Adjournment

Mr. Hart adjourned the meeting at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Patenaude
Capital Projects and Personnel Assistant

Maintain and repair all schools. Roof and window replacements, ADA and technology upgrades.

Maintain and repair all schools. Roof and window replacements, ADA and technology upgrades. New heating and ventilating systems, gym floors, gym folding partitions at all elementary schools.

New heating and ventilating systems, gym floors, gym folding partitions at all elementary schools.

- 15 -

Newfield Construction, Inc.
Elementary Schools- Media Center and Computer Room Addition, Renovate as New, Roof Replacement,
OPTION B
Addition at Southeast to Replace Modulares
Middle School- Additions, Roof Replacement and Selective Heavy Renovations
December 14, 2009

	Vinton			Goodwin			Southeast			Middle School		
	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total
Light Renovation	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
Medium Renovation	0	143	0	0	143	0	0	143	0	0	143	0
Heavy Ren. (Ren as New)	35,900	240	8,616,000	38,600	240	9,264,000	33,700	240	8,088,000	4,821	240	1,157,040
Roof Replacement	38,552	15	578,280	41,009	15	615,135	35,847	15	537,705	79,538	15	1,193,070
Solar Panels			757,191			813,251			687,435			1,953,858
Window Replacement			777,000			652,000			778,000			450,000
Phasing Construction	5,830	100	583,000	5,830	100	583,000	5,830	100	583,000	0	100	0
Site			1,500,000			1,500,000			1,500,000			1,100,000
New Construction	5,830	350	2,040,500	5,360	350	1,876,000	12,700	350	4,445,000	9,358	350	3,275,300
Total Construction Costs			14,851,971			15,303,386			16,619,140			9,129,268
Estimated Soft Costs 20%			3,712,993			3,825,847			4,154,785			2,282,317
Construction and Soft Costs			18,564,964			19,129,233			20,773,925			11,411,585
Escalation 3% per year	3yr	9%	1,670,847	3yr	9%	1,721,631	3.5yr	10.5%	2,181,262	3.5 Yr	10.5%	1,198,216
Total Project Budget			20,235,810			20,850,863			22,955,187			12,609,801
Net State Reimbursement			9,394,097			7,945,960			10,355,774			7,526,534
Cost to Mansfield			10,841,713			12,904,904			12,599,414			5,083,267
Estimated Ineligible Costs			2,227,796			2,295,508			2,492,871			1,369,390
Estimated Eligible Costs			18,008,015			18,555,356			20,462,316			11,240,411
State Reimbursement 77.86%			14,021,040			14,447,200			15,931,959			8,751,784
Reimbursement Penalty			4,626,943			-6,501,240			-5,576,186			-1,225,250
Net State Reimbursement			9,394,097			7,945,960			10,355,774			7,526,534
Existing Square Footage (net)	34,520			37,466			38,065			110,433		
Proposed Square Footage	48,694			54,194			51,119			116,197		
State Allowable Sq. Footage	32,488			29,636			33,480			99,712		
Square Footage Penalty %	33%			45%			35%			14%		
Ren as New State Comparison	32,488	370	12,020,560	29,636	370	10,965,320	33,480	370	12,387,600			

OPTION C **Newfield Construction, Inc.**

Total Project Cost Analysis Two Elementary Schools, Additions, Roof Replacement, Renovate as New
 April 27, 2010 Two Elementary Schools, Close One Elementary School
 Middle School- Additions, Roof Replacement and Selective Heavy Renovations

	Vinton			Southeast			Middle School		
	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total
Light Renovation	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
Medium Renovation	0	143	0	0	143	0	0	143	0
Heavy Ren. (Ren as New)	35,550	240	8,532,000	33,577	240	8,058,480	4,821	240	1,157,040
Roof Replacement	38,552	15	578,280	35,847	15	537,705	79,538	15	1,193,070
Solar Panels			757,191			813,251			1,953,858
Window Replacement			777,000			652,000			450,000
Phasing Construction	6,000	100	600,000	6,000	100	600,000	0	100	0
Site			1,500,000			1,500,000			1,100,000
New Construction	17,746	350	6,211,100	24,433	350	8,551,550	9,358	350	3,275,300
Total Construction Costs			18,955,571			20,712,986			9,129,268
Estimated Soft Costs			4,170,226			4,556,857			2,008,439
Construction and Soft Costs			23,125,797			25,269,843			11,137,707
Escalation 3% per year	3yr	9%	2,081,322	3yr	9%	2,274,286	3.5 Yr	10.5%	1,169,459
Total Project Budget			25,207,118			27,544,129			12,307,166
Net State Reimbursement			14,424,640			14,479,030			7,054,866
Cost to Mansfield			10,782,478			13,065,099			5,252,301
Estimated Ineligible Costs			2,843,336			3,106,948			1,369,390
Estimated Eligible Costs			22,363,783			24,437,181			10,937,776
State Reimbursement 75%			16,772,837			18,327,886			8,203,332
Reimbursement Penalty			-2,348,197			-3,848,856			-1,148,466
Net State Reimbursement			14,424,640			14,479,030			7,054,866
Existing Square Footage (net)	33,773			31,898			110,433		
Proposed Square Footage	50,631			55,110			116,197		
State Allowable Sq. Footage	43,400			43,400			99,712		
Square Footage Penalty %	14%			21%			14%		
									35,958,535
									29,099,878
									35,958,535

Newfield Construction, Inc.

Mansfield Schools **OPTION D** **One New Elementary School at Southeast, Demolish Existing Southeast School,**
Total Project Cost Analysis **700 Students** **Close Vinton and Goodwin**
March 26, 2010 **Middle School- Additions, Roof Replacement and Selective Heavy Renovations**

	New School			Middle School			Grand Totals
	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total	
Heavy Renovation	0	240	0	4,821	240	1,157,040	
Roof Replacement	0	15	0	79,538	15	1,193,070	
Solar Panels			0			1,953,858	
Window Replacement			0			450,000	
Demolish Existing Southeast School	38,065	17	647,105	0	0	0	
Site			3,640,000			1,100,000	
New Construction	100,926	225	22,708,350	9,358	350	3,275,300	
Total Construction Costs			26,995,455			9,129,268	
Estimated Soft Costs			5,939,000			2,008,439	
Construction and Soft Costs			32,934,455			11,137,707	
Escalation 3% per year	3yr	9%	2,964,101	3yr	9%	1,002,394	
Total Project Budget			35,898,556			12,140,101	48,038,657
Net State Reimbursement			22,024,849			6,947,108	28,971,958
Cost to Mansfield			13,873,707			5,192,992	19,066,699
Estimated Ineligible Costs			1,349,773			1,369,390	
Estimated Eligible Costs			34,548,783			10,770,710	
State Reimbursement 75%			25,911,587			8,078,033	
Reimbursement Penalty			-3,886,738			-1,130,925	
Net State Reimbursement			22,024,849			6,947,108	28,971,958
Existing Square Footage (net)				110,433			
Proposed Square Footage (net)	95,880			116,197			
State Allowable Sq. Footage	81,200			99,712			
Square Footage Penalty %	15%			14%			
Demolish Vinton School*	34,520	17	586,840				
Demolish Goodwin School*	37,466	17	636,922				

*Not included in Cost to Mansfield

Newfield Construction, Inc.

Mansfield Schools OPTION E Two New Elementary Schools at Vinton and Southeast, Demolish

Total Project Cost Analysis 700 Students Existing Vinton and Southeast Schools, Close Goodwin.

March 26, 2010 Middle School- Additions, Roof Replacement and Selective Heavy Renovations

	New Vinton School			New Southeast School			Middle School		
	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total	Sq. Ft.	Value/ Sq Ft	Total
Heavy Renovations	0	240	0	0	240	0	4,821	240	1,157,040
Roof Replacement	0	15	0	0	15	0	79,538	15	1,193,070
Solar Panels			0			0			1,953,858
Window Replacement			0			0			450,000
Demolish Vinton & Southeast Schools	34,520	17	586,840	38,065	17	647,105	0	17	0
Site			3,000,000			3,000,000			1,100,000
New Construction	61,012	230	14,032,760	61,012	230	14,032,760	9,358	350	3,275,300
Total Construction Costs			17,619,600			17,679,865			9,129,268
Estimated Soft Costs			3,876,312			3,889,570			2,008,439
Construction and Soft Costs			21,495,912			21,569,435			11,137,707
Escalation 3% per year	3yr	9%	1,934,632	3yr	9%	1,941,249	4.5 Yr	13.5%	1,503,590
Total Project Budget			23,430,544			23,510,684			12,641,297
Net State Reimbursement			12,684,130			12,727,514			7,270,380
Cost to Mansfield			10,746,414			10,783,171			5,370,917
Estimated Ineligible Costs			880,980			883,993			1,369,390
Estimated Eligible Costs			22,549,564			22,626,691			11,271,907
State Reimbursement 75%			16,912,173			16,970,018			8,453,930
Reimbursement Penalty			-4,228,043			-4,242,505			-1,183,550
Net State Reimbursement			12,684,130			12,727,514			7,270,380
Existing Square Footage (net)	34,520			38,065			110,433		
Proposed Square Footage (net)	57,961			57,961			116,197		
State Allowable Sq. Footage	43,400			43,400			99,712		
Square Footage Penalty %	25%			25%			14%		
Demolish Goodwin School*	37,466	17	636,922						
*Not included in Cost to Mansfield									
									32,682,024
									26,900,502

Attachment 3

JOB NAME
BID TYPE
DATE

DOROTHY GOODWIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
REPAIR BUDGET
14-May-08

OPTION A

DESCRIPTION	LABOR	MATERIAL	SUB PRICE	TOTAL	ELIGIBLE	INELIG.
SEPTIC SYSTEM	0	0	80000	80,000		80,000
PLAYSCAPE	60000	15000		75,000	75,000	0
PAVED PLAY AREA (3000 SF)	0	0	15000	15,000		15,000
OIL TANK REPLACEMENT	47585	101263	0	148,848		148,848
ADJUST GRADE FOR HANDICAP ACCESSIBILITY	0	0	75000	75,000	75,000	
ASBESTOS ABATEMENT ALLOWANCE			150000	150,000	150,000	
				0		0
ROOF REPLACEMENT	0	0	697153	697,153	697,153	
BULKHEADS AT TUNNELS	0	0	36000	36,000		36,000
WINDOW REPLACEMENT	102839	188788	0	291,627	60,000	231,627
EXTERIOR DOOR REPLACEMENT			34000	34,000		34,000
WALL REPLACEMENT AT TRANSITE WALLS	0	0	469350	469,350	50,000	419,350
OPERABLE PARTITION AT GYM ALLOWANCE	0	0	40000	40,000		40,000
				0		0
TOILET ROOM ADA MODIFICATIONS			72000	72,000	72,000	
CLASSROOM DOORWAY RENOVATIONS	100225	46075		146,300	146,300	
				0		0
GYM FLOOR REPLACEMENT	0	0	50400	50,400		50,400
VCT REPLACEMENT (NONE)	0	0	0	0		0
				0		0
KITCHEN UPGRADES	0	0	100000	100,000	50,000	50,000
				0		0
VENTILATION SYSTEM			820180	820,180		820,180
REPLACE HVAC CONTROL & HEAT SYSTEM	0	0	1353297	1,353,297		1,353,297
REPLACE BOILERS	0	0	200000	200,000		200,000
				0		0
REPLACE PLUMBING FIXTURES	20000	15000	138000	173,000		173,000
				0		0
ELECTRICAL SERVICE UPGRADES (1200 AMP)	0	0	100000	100,000		100,000
NU CHARGES			15000	15,000		15,000
SUB PANEL UPGRADES (ALLOW 15 PANELS)	0	0	112500	112,500		112,500
NEW FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	0	0	100000	100,000		100,000
TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES	0	0	180000	180,000		180,000
				0		0
SUBTOTAL				5,534,655	1,375,453	4,159,202
LEEDS CONSTRUCTION (5%)				276,733	68,773	207,960
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS				5,811,387	1,444,226	4,367,162
					25%	75%

JOB NAME
 BID TYPE
 DATE

SOUTHEAST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
 REPAIR BUDGET
 14-May-08

OPTION A

DESCRIPTION	LABOR	MATERIAL	SUB PRICE	TOTAL	ELIGIBLE	INELIG.
PAVED PLAY AREA (3000 SF)	0	0	15000	15,000		15,000
OIL TANK REPLACEMENT	47585	101263	0	148,848		148,848
ADJUST GRADE FOR HANDICAP ACCESSIBILITY	0	0	75000	75,000	75,000	0
ASBESTOS ABATEMENT ALLOWANCE			150000	150,000	150,000	
				0		0
ROOF REPLACEMENT	0	0	609399	609,399	609,399	
RELOCATABLE ROOF REPLACEMENT			105600	105,600	105,600	
				0		0
				0		0
BULKHEADS AT TUNNELS	0	0	36000	36,000		36,000
WINDOW REPLACEMENT	100595	196405	0	297,000	60,000	237,000
EXTERIOR DOOR REPLACEMENT			64000	64,000		64,000
WALL REPLACEMENT AT TRANSITE WALLS	0	0	600600	600,600	60,000	540,600
OPERABLE PARTITION AT GYM ALLOWANCE	0	0	40000	40,000		40,000
				0		0
TOILET ROOM ADA MODIFICATIONS			57000	57,000	57,000	0
CLASSROOM DOORWAY RENOVATIONS	68575	31525		100,100	100,100	
				0		0
GYM FLOOR REPLACEMENT	0	0	59136	59,136		59,136
VCT REPLACEMENT	0	0	15000	15,000		15,000
				0		0
KITCHEN UPGRADES	0	0	100000	100,000	50,000	50,000
				0		0
VENTILATION SYSTEM			757060	757,060		757,060
REPLACE HVAC CONTROL & HEAT SYSTEM	0	0	1249149	1,249,149		1,249,149
REPLACE BOILERS	0	0	200000	200,000		200,000
				0		0
REPLACE PLUMBING FIXTURES	20000	15000	106000	141,000		141,000
				0		0
ELECTRICAL SERVICE UPGRADES (1200 AMP)	0	0	100000	100,000		100,000
NU CHARGES			15000	15,000		15,000
SUB PANEL UPGRADES (ALLOW 15 PANELS)	0	0	112500	112,500		112,500
NEW FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	0	0	100000	100,000		100,000
TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES	0	0	180000	180,000		180,000
				0		0
SUBTOTAL				5,327,392	1,267,099	4,060,293
LEEDS CONSTRUCTION (5%)				266,370	63,355	203,015
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS				5,593,762	1,330,454	4,263,308
					24%	76%

JOB NAME
 BID TYPE
 DATE

ANNIE E. VINTON SCHOOL
 REPAIR BUDGET
 14-May-08

OPTION A

DESCRIPTION	LABOR	MATERIAL	SUB PRICE	TOTAL	ELIGIBLE	INELIG.
SEPTIC SYSTEM	0	0	75000	75,000		75,000
PLAYSCAPE	60000	15000		75,000	75,000	
PAVED PLAY AREA (3000 SF)	0	0	15000	15,000		15,000
OIL TANK REPLACEMENT	47585	101263	0	148,848		148,848
ADJUST GRADE FOR HANDICAP ACCESSIBILITY	0	0	75000	75,000	75,000	
ASBESTOS ABATEMENT ALLOWANCE			150000	150,000	150,000	
ROOF REPLACEMENT	0	0	655384	655,384	655,384	
WINDOW REPLACEMENT	106744	191070	0	297,814	242,814	55,000
EXTERIOR DOOR REPLACEMENT			30000	30,000		30,000
WALL REPLACEMENT AT TRANSITE WALLS	0	0	478800	478,800	50,000	428,800
OPERABLE PARTITION AT GYM ALLOWANCE	0	0	40000	40,000		40,000
TOILET ROOM ADA MODIFICATIONS			45000	45,000	45,000	
CLASSROOM DOORWAY RENOVATIONS	84400	38800		123,200	123,200	
GYM FLOOR REPLACEMENT	0	0	45920	45,920		45,920
VCT REPLACEMENT	0	0	20000	20,000		20,000
KITCHEN UPGRADES	0	0	75000	75,000	40,000	35,000
VENTILATION SYSTEM			771040	771,040		771,040
REPLACE HVAC CONTROL & HEAT SYSTEM	0	0	1272216	1,272,216		1,272,216
REPLACE BOILERS	0	0	200000	200,000		200,000
REPLACE PLUMBING FIXTURES	15000	10000	84000	109,000		109,000
ELECTRICAL SERVICE UPGRADES (1200 AMP)	0	0	100000	100,000		100,000
NU CHARGES			15000	15,000		15,000
SUB PANEL UPGRADES (ALLOW 15 PANELS)	0	0	112500	112,500		112,500
NEW FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	0	0	100000	100,000	100,000	
TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES	0	0	180000	180,000		180,000
SUBTOTAL				5,209,722	1,556,398	3,653,324
LEEDS CONSTRUCTION (5%)				260,486	77,820	182,666
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS				5,470,208	1,634,218	3,835,990
					30%	70%

JOB NAME
BID TYPE
DATE

MANSFIELD MIDDLE SCHOOL
REPAIR BUDGET
14-May-08

OPTION A

DESCRIPTION	LABOR	MATERIAL	SUB PRICE	TOTAL	ELIGIBLE	INELIG.
ADJUST GRADE FOR HANDICAP ACCESIBILITY	0	0	75000	75,000	75,000	
ASBESTOS REMOVAL			300000	300,000	300,000	
				0		0
ROOF REPLACEMENT	0	0	1352146	1,352,146	1,352,146	
SOFFIT PANEL REPLACEMENT	0	0	270000	270,000		270,000
RELOCATABLE ROOFS	0	0	88000	88,000	88,000	
				0		0
				0		0
WINDOW REPLACEMENT	129360	163680	0	293,040	249,840	43,200
EXTERIOR DOOR REPLACEMENT			51000	51,000		51,000
				0		0
TOILET ROOM ADA MODIFICATIONS			90000	90,000	90,000	
CLASSROOM DOORWAY RENOVATIONS	279575	128525		408,100	408,100	
				0		0
NEW ELEVATOR, ADA COMPLIANT	0	0	180000	180,000	180,000	
				0		0
REPLACE PLUMBING FIXTURES	20000	15000	100000	135,000		135,000
				0		0
NEW FIRE ALARM SYSTEM	0	0	250000	250,000	250,000	
TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES	0	0	275000	275,000		275,000
				0		0
SUBTOTAL				3,767,286	2,993,086	774,200
LEEDS CONSTRUCTION (5%)				188,364	149,654	38,710
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS				3,955,650	3,142,740	812,910
					79%	21%

Predicted and Potential School Building Repairs/Replacements

	Goodwin		Southeast		Vinton		Middle School		District
	Item	Cost	Item	Cost	Item	Cost	Item	Cost	
2010-11	Roofs repair	\$2,500**	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	\$10,000**
	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	\$4,000*
	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	\$4,000*
	Confined Space Leaks	\$5,000***	Confined Space Leaks	\$5,000***	Confined Space Leaks	\$5,000***			\$15,000***
Total		\$9,500		\$9,500		\$9,500		\$4,500	\$33,000
2011-12	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	Roof Repairs	\$9,500**	Roof Repairs	\$9,500**	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	\$24,000**
	Office A/C	\$10,000***	Office A/C	\$10,000***	Office A/C	\$10,000***			\$30,000***
	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	\$4,000*
	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	Floor Tiles	\$5,000*	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	\$8,000*
	Septic Field	\$35,000***	Oil Line Replacement	\$25,000***	Septic Field	\$35,000***			\$95,000***
	Boiler Replacement	\$60,000***	Electric Panels	\$10,000***	Boiler Replacement	\$60,000***			\$130,000***
	Electric Panels	\$10,000***							\$10,000***
Total		\$119,500		\$60,500		\$116,500		\$4,500	\$301,000
2012-13	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	\$10,000**
	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	\$4,000*
	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	\$4,000*
	Gym Floor	\$40,000***	Gym Floor	\$40,000***	Gym Floor	\$40,000***			\$120,000***
Total		\$44,500		\$44,500		\$44,500		\$4,500	\$138,000
2013-14	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	Roof Repairs	\$2,500**	\$10,000**
	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	Plumbing	\$1,000*	\$4,000*
	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	Floor Tiles	\$1,000*	\$4,000*
	Gym Partition	\$20,000***	Gym Partition	\$20,000***	Gym Partition	\$20,000***			\$60,000***
Total		\$24,500		\$24,500		\$24,500		\$4,500	\$78,000
Grand Total		\$198,000		\$139,000		\$195,000		\$18,000	\$541,000

Bold: Predicted – Based on last 2 years' experience

* Included in annual budget

** Capital

*** Other funding source